

REMARKS

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Office Action dated January 10, 2006, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-39 remain pending the application. Claims 34, 36, 38 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-4, 16-19, 31, 35 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (“Selective Area Image Compression,” Volume 29, Issue 12, page number 5356-5357, May 1, 1987, referred to as “IBM Technical Disclosure”) and Wang et al. (U.S.P. 4,598,369). Claims 5, 6, 20 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “IBM TECHNICAL DISCLOSURE” as modified by Wang et al. and further in view of Kuni et al. (JP 405272952A). Claims 7, 8, 22 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “IBM TECHNICAL DISCLOSURE” as modified by Wang et al. and further in view of Nakajima et al. (U.S.P. 4,944,189). Claims 9-12, 14, 15, 24-27, 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “IBM TECHNICAL DISCLOSURE” as modified by Wang et al. and further in view of Hama et al. (U.S.P. 4,751,507). Claims 13 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “IBM TECHNICAL DISCLOSURE” as modified by Wang et al. and Kuni et al. and further in view of Hama et al. Claims 32 and 33 have been deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully submits the following arguments in traversal of the prior art rejections..

With regard to the Section 112 rejection, the Examiner admits that the specification describes distance and angle measurements between two points. Applicant submits that claims 34, 36, 38 and 39 do not describe measurement relative to a single point as the Examiner contends, but that the measurement is made relative to a measurement point, in relation to an object of the image which is a second point of reference generally described in the specification. Therefore, the claims as pending are supported adequately by the disclosure. To expedite prosecution of this case, Applicant hereinabove amends claims 34, 36, and 38-39 to describe a second measurement point, which the Examiner concedes is supported by the disclosure and should not raise new issues.

Independent claims 1 and 16 are rewritten to include the subject matter of claim 32 which was previously deemed allowable.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114
U.S. Application No. 09/539,409

Attorney Docket No. Q56564

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Susan P. Fair
Registration No. 41,239

SUGHRIUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 9, 2007